

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

CASE:

JUAN CARLOS GIL,

Plaintiff,

v.

R3S2K3, LLC, SUBWAY 273, INC and
100% KEY BISCAYNE, LLC D/B/A
D'LITE BISTRO & BAKERY,

Defendants.

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, JUAN CARLOS GIL, individually and on behalf of all other similarly situated mobility-impaired individuals (hereinafter "Plaintiff"), sues, Defendants, R3S2K3, LLC, SUBWAY 273, INC and 100% KEY BISCAYNE, LLC D/B/A D'LITE BISTRO & BAKERY, (hereinafter "Defendants"), and as grounds alleges:

JURISDICTION, PARTIES. AND VENUE

1. This is an action for injunctive relief, a declaration of rights, attorneys' fees, litigation expenses, and costs pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12181, *et seq.*, (the "Americans with Disabilities Act" or "ADA") and 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

2. The Court has original jurisdiction over Plaintiff's claims arising under 42 U.S.C. § 12181, *et seq.* pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343 and 42 U.S.C. § 12117(a).

3. The Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, and may render declaratory judgment on the existence or nonexistence of any right under 42 U.S.C. § 12181, *et seq.*

4. Plaintiff, JUAN CARLOS GIL, is an individual over eighteen years of age, with a

residence in Miami-Dade County, Florida, and is otherwise *sui juris*.

5. At all times material, Defendant, R3S2K3, LLC, was and is a Florida Limited Liability Company, organized under the laws of the State of Florida, with its principal place of business in Key Biscayne, Florida.

6. At all times material, Defendant, R3S2K3, LLC, owned and operated a commercial shopping plaza located at 180 Crandon Boulevard Key Biscayne, Florida 33149 (hereinafter the “Commercial Property”) and conducted a substantial amount of business in that place of public accommodation in Miami-Dade County, Florida.

7. At all times material, Defendant, SUBWAY 273, INC, was and is a Florida Profit Corporation, organized under the laws of the State of Florida, with its principal place of business in Key Biscayne, Florida.

8. At all times material, Defendant, SUBWAY 273, INC, owned and operated a commercial restaurant located at 180 Crandon Boulevard, Suite 108, Key Biscayne, Florida 33149¹ (hereinafter the “Commercial Property”) and conducted a substantial amount of business in that place of public accommodation in Miami-Dade County, Florida. Defendant, SUBWAY 273, INC, holds itself out to the public as “Subway”.

9. At all times material, Defendant, 100% KEY BISCAYNE, LLC, was and is a Florida Limited Liability Company, organized under the laws of the State of Florida, with its principal place of business in Key Biscayne, Florida.

¹ This address is located within the commercial shopping center and place of public accommodation at 180 Crandon Boulevard Key Biscayne, Florida 33149 owned and operated by landlord Defendant, R3S2K3, LLC.

10. At all times material, Defendant, 100% KEY BISCAYNE, LLC, owned and operated a commercial restaurant located at 180 Crandon Boulevard, Suite 101-102, Key Biscayne, Florida 33149² (hereinafter the “Commercial Property”) and conducted a substantial amount of business in that place of public accommodation in Miami-Dade County, Florida. Defendant, 100% KEY BISCAYNE, LLC, holds itself out to the public as “D’Lite Bistro & Bakery”.

11. Venue is properly located in the Southern District of Florida because Defendants’ Commercial Property is located in Miami-Dade County, Florida, Defendants regularly conduct business within Miami-Dade County, Florida, and because a substantial part(s) of the events or omissions giving rise to these claims occurred in Miami-Dade County, Florida.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

12. Although over thirty (30) years have passed since the effective date of Title III of the ADA, Defendants have yet to make its facilities accessible to individuals with disabilities.

13. Congress provided commercial businesses one and a half years to implement the Act. The effective date was January 26, 1992. In spite of this abundant lead-time and the extensive publicity the ADA has received since 1990, Defendants continue to discriminate against people who are disabled in ways that block them from access and use of Defendants’ businesses and properties.

14. The ADA prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in 28 CFR 36.201 and

² This address is located within the commercial shopping center and place of public accommodation at 180 Crandon Boulevard Key Biscayne, Florida 33149 owned and operated by landlord Defendant, R3S2K3, LLC.

requires landlords and tenants to be liable for compliance.

15. Plaintiff, JUAN CARLOS GIL, is an individual with disabilities as defined by and pursuant to the ADA. Plaintiff, JUAN CARLOS GIL, is substantially limited in major life activities due to his impairment and requires the use of a wheelchair to ambulate.

16. Defendant, R3S2K3, LLC, owns, operates and/or oversees the Commercial Property, its general parking lot and parking spots.

17. The subject Commercial Property is open to the public and is located in Key Biscayne, Florida, in Miami-Dade County.

18. The individual Plaintiff visits the Commercial Property and businesses located within the Commercial Property, regularly, to include visits to the Commercial Property and businesses located within the Commercial Property on or about March 31, 2022 and encountered multiple violations of the ADA that directly affected his ability to use and enjoy the Commercial Property and businesses located therein. He often visits the Commercial Property and businesses located within the Commercial Property in order to avail himself of the goods and services offered there, and because it is approximately ten (10) miles from his residence and is near other businesses he frequents as a patron. He plans to return to the Commercial Property and the businesses located within the Commercial Property within two (2) months of the filing of this Complaint, specifically on or before August 15th, 2022.

19. Plaintiff resides nearby in the same County and state as the Commercial Property and the businesses located within the Commercial Property, has regularly frequented the Defendants' Commercial Property and the businesses located within the Commercial Property for the intended purposes because of the proximity to his residence and other businesses that he

frequents as a patron and intends to return to the Commercial Property within two (2) months of the filing of this Complaint, specifically on or before August 15th, 2022.

20. The Plaintiff found the Commercial Property, and the businesses located within the Commercial Property to be rife with ADA violations. The Plaintiff encountered architectural barriers at the Commercial Property, and businesses located within the Commercial Property and wishes to continue his patronage and use of each of the premises.

21. The Plaintiff has encountered architectural barriers that are in violation of the ADA at the subject Commercial Property, and businesses located within the Commercial Property. The barriers to access at the Commercial Property, and the businesses located within the Commercial Property have each denied or diminished Plaintiff's ability to visit the Commercial Property, and businesses located within the Commercial Property, and have endangered his safety in violation of the ADA. The barriers to access, which are set forth below, have likewise posed a risk of injury(ies), embarrassment, and discomfort to Plaintiff, JUAN CARLOS GIL, and others similarly situated.

22. Defendants, R3S2K3, LLC; SUBWAY 273, INC; and 100% KEY BISCAYNE, LLC D/B/A D'LITE BISTRO & BAKERY, own and/or operate a place of public accommodation as defined by the ADA and the regulations implementing the ADA, 28 CFR 36.201 (a) and 36.104. Defendants, R3S2K3, LLC, SUBWAY 273, INC and 100% KEY BISCAYNE, LLC D/B/A D'LITE BISTRO & BAKERY are responsible for complying with the obligations of the ADA. The place of public accommodation that Defendants, R3S2K3, LLC, SUBWAY 273, INC and 100% KEY BISCAYNE, LLC D/B/A D'LITE BISTRO & BAKERY, owns and operates is the Commercial Property Business located at 180 Crandon Boulevard Key Biscayne, Florida 33149.

23. Plaintiff, JUAN CARLOS GIL, has a realistic, credible, existing and continuing threat of discrimination from the Defendants' non-compliance with the ADA with respect to the described Commercial Property and the businesses located within the Commercial Property, including but not necessarily limited to the allegations in Counts I through III of this Complaint. Plaintiff has reasonable grounds to believe that he will continue to be subjected to discrimination at the Commercial Property, and businesses located within the Commercial Property, in violation of the ADA. Plaintiff desires to visit the Commercial Property and businesses located therein, not only to avail himself of the goods and services available at the Commercial Property, and businesses located within the Commercial Property, but to assure himself that the Commercial Property and businesses located within the Commercial Property are in compliance with the ADA, so that he and others similarly situated will have full and equal enjoyment of the Commercial Property, and businesses located within the Commercial Property without fear of discrimination.

24. Defendant, R3S2K3, LLC, as landlord and owner of the Commercial Property Business, is responsible for all ADA violations listed in this complaint.

25. Plaintiff, JUAN CARLOS GIL, has a realistic, credible, existing and continuing threat of discrimination from the Defendants' non-compliance with the ADA with respect to the described Commercial Property and businesses located within the Commercial Property, but not necessarily limited to the allegations in this Complaint. Plaintiff has reasonable grounds to believe that he will continue to be subjected to discrimination at the Commercial Property, and businesses within the Commercial Property, in violation of the ADA. Plaintiff desires to visit the Commercial Property and businesses within the Commercial Property, not only to avail himself of the goods and services available at the Commercial Property and businesses located within the Commercial

Property, but to assure himself that the Commercial Property, and businesses located within the Commercial Property are in compliance with the ADA, so that he and others similarly situated will have full and equal enjoyment of the Commercial Property, and businesses located within the Commercial Property without fear of discrimination.

26. Defendants have discriminated against the individual Plaintiff by denying him access to, and full and equal enjoyment of, the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of the Commercial Property, and businesses located within the Commercial Property, as prohibited by 42 U.S.C. § 12182 et seq.

COUNT I - ADA VIOLATIONS
AS TO DEFENDANT, R3S2K3, LLC

27. The Plaintiff adopts and re-alleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 26 above as though fully set forth herein.

28. Defendant, R3S2K3, LLC has discriminated, and continues to discriminate, against Plaintiff in violation of the ADA by failing, inter alia, to have accessible facilities by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if a Defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). A list of the violations that Plaintiff encountered during his visit to the Commercial Property, include but are not limited to, the following:

A. Entrance Access and Path of Travel

- i. The Plaintiff had difficulty traversing the path of travel, as it was not continuous and accessible. Violation: There are inaccessible routes from the public sidewalk and transportation stop. These are violations of the requirements in Sections 4.3.2(1), 4.3.8, 4.5.1, and 4.5.2 of the ADAAG and Sections 206.2.1, 302.1, 303, and 402.2 of the 2010 ADA

Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

- ii. The Plaintiff had difficulty traversing the path of travel, as there are wide openings on ground surfaces. Violation: There are inaccessible routes with openings more than ½". These are violations of the requirements in Section 4.5.4 of the ADAAG and Section 302.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iii. The Plaintiff had difficulty using ramps, as they are located on an excessive slope. Violation: Ramps at the facility contain excessive slopes, violating Section 4.8.2 of the ADAAG and Section 405.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iv. The Plaintiff had difficulty on the path of travel at the facility, as ramps do not have compliant handrails violating Section 4.8.5 of the ADAAG and Section 405.8 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

COUNT II - ADA VIOLATIONS
AS TO DEFENDANTS, R3S2K3, LLC AND SUBWAY 273, INC.

29. The Plaintiff adopts and re-alleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 26 above as though fully set forth herein.

30. Defendants, R3S2K3, LLC and Subway 273, Inc., have discriminated, and continue to discriminate, against Plaintiff in violation of the ADA by failing, inter alia, to have accessible facilities by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if a Defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). A list of the violations that Plaintiff encountered during his visit to the Commercial Property, include but are not limited to, the following:

A. Public Restrooms

- i. The Plaintiff could not enter the restroom without assistance, as the required maneuvering clearance is not provided. Violation: The restroom door does not provide the required latch side clearance violating Section 4.13.6 of the ADAAG and Section 404.2.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- ii. The restroom signage is not mounted at the required location, violating Section 4.30.6 of the ADAAG and Section 703.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iii. The Plaintiff could not use the toilet without assistance as the seat is not mounted at the required height. Violation: The water closet seats are mounted at a non-compliant height from the floor in violation of Section 4.16.3 of the ADAAG and Section 604.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

COUNT III - ADA VIOLATIONS
AS TO DEFENDANTS, R3S2K3, LLC
AND 100% KEY BISCAYNE, LLC.

31. The Plaintiff adopts and re-alleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through above as though fully set forth herein.

32. Defendants, R3S2K3, LLC and 100% Key Biscayne, LLC, have discriminated, and continue to discriminate, against Plaintiff in violation of the ADA by failing, inter alia, to have accessible facilities by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if a Defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). A list of the violations that Plaintiff encountered during his visit to the Commercial Property, include but are not limited to, the following:

A. Access to Goods and Services

- i. There is seating provided at the facility that does not comply with the standards prescribed in Section 4.32 of the ADAAG and Sections 226 & 902 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

B. Public Restrooms

- i. There are permanently designated interior spaces without proper signage, violating Section 4.1.3(16) and 4.30 of the ADAAG and Sections 216.2 and 703 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- ii. The Plaintiff had difficulty using the locking mechanism on the restroom door without assistance, as it requires tight grasping. Violation: The restroom door has non-compliant hardware for disabled patrons, violating Sections 4.13.9 & 4.27.4 of the ADAAG and Sections 309.4 & 404.2.7 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iii. The Plaintiff could not use the coat hook without assistance, as it is mounted too high. Violation: There are coat hooks provided for public use in the restroom, outside the reach ranges prescribed in Sections 4.2.5, 4.2.6, and 4.25.3 of the ADAAG and Sections 308 and 604.8.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iv. The Plaintiff could not use the lavatory without assistance, as the required knee & toe clearances are not provided. Violation: There are lavatories in public restrooms without the required clearances provided, violating the requirements in Section 4.19.2 and Figure 31 of the ADAAG and Sections 306 and 606.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- v. The Plaintiff could not transfer to the toilet without assistance, as a trashcan obstructed the

clear floor space. Violation: The required clear floor space is not provided next to the toilet, violating Section 4.16.2 & Figure 28 of the ADAAG, 28 CFR 36.211, and 604.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

- vi. The Plaintiff could not transfer to the toilet without assistance, as objects are mounted less than 12” above a grab bar obstructing its use. Violation: The grab bars do not comply with the requirements prescribed in Sections 4.16.4 & 4.26 of the ADAAG and Section 609.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- vii. The Plaintiff could not transfer to the toilet without assistance, as the side grab bar is not the required length. Violation: The grab bars do not comply with the requirements prescribed in Section 4.16.4 and Figure 29 of the ADAAG and Sections 604.5.1 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- viii. The Plaintiff could not use the toilet paper dispenser without assistance, as it is not mounted at the required location. Violation: The toilet paper dispenser is not mounted in accordance with Section 4.16.6 and Figure 29 of the ADAAG and Section 604.7 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

RELIEF SOUGHT AND THE BASIS

33. The discriminatory violations described in this Complaint are not an exclusive list of the Defendants’ ADA violations. Plaintiff requests an inspection of the Defendants’ place of public accommodation in order to photograph and measure all of the discriminatory acts violating the ADA and barriers to access in conjunction with Rule 34 and timely notice. Plaintiff further requests to inspect any and all barriers to access that were concealed by virtue of the barriers’

presence, which prevented Plaintiff, JUAN CARLOS GIL, from further ingress, use, and equal enjoyment of the Commercial Property and the business therein; Plaintiff requests to be physically present at such inspection in conjunction with Rule 34 and timely notice. Plaintiff requests the inspection in order to participate in crafting a remediation plan to address Plaintiff's request for injunctive relief.

34. The individual Plaintiff, and all other individuals similarly situated, have been denied access to, and have been denied full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities privileges, benefits, programs and activities offered by Defendants' Commercial Property and the business within the Commercial Property; and has otherwise been discriminated against and damaged by the Defendants because of the Defendants' ADA violations as set forth above. The individual Plaintiff, and all others similarly situated, will continue to suffer such discrimination, injury and damage without the immediate relief provided by the ADA as requested herein. In order to remedy the discriminatory situation, the Plaintiff requires an inspection of the Defendants' place of public accommodation in order to determine all of the areas of non-compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Plaintiff further requests a remediation plan and the opportunity to participate in the crafting of the remediation plan.

35. Defendants have discriminated against the individual Plaintiff by denying him access to full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of their places of public accommodation or commercial facility, in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12181 et seq. and 28 CFR 36.302 et seq. Furthermore, the Defendants continue to discriminate against Plaintiff, and all those similarly situated, by failing to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford

all offered goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages or accommodations to individuals with disabilities; and by failing to take such efforts that may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services.

36. Plaintiff is without adequate remedy at law, will suffer irreparable harm, and have a clear legal right to the relief sought. Further, injunctive relief will serve the public interest and all those similarly situated to Plaintiff. Plaintiff has retained the undersigned counsel and is entitled to recover attorneys' fees, costs and litigation expenses from Defendants pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12205 and 28 CFR 36.505.

37. A Defendant is required to remove the existing architectural barriers to the physically disabled when such removal is readily achievable for their place of public similarly situated, will continue to suffer such discrimination, injury and damage without the immediate relief provided by the ADA as requested herein. In order to remedy the discriminatory situation, the Plaintiff require an inspection of the Defendants place of public accommodation in order to determine all of the areas of non-compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

38. Notice to Defendant is not required as a result of the Defendant's failure to cure the violations by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if a Defendant have 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). All other conditions precedent have been met by Plaintiff or waived by the Defendant.

39. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188, the Court is provided with authority to grant Plaintiff Injunctive Relief, including an order to alter the property where Defendants operate their business, located within the Commercial Property located in Miami-Dade County, the interiors,

exterior areas, and the common exterior areas of the Commercial Property and business to make those facilities readily accessible and useable to the Plaintiff and all other mobility-impaired persons; or by closing the facility until such time as the Defendants cure their violations of the ADA.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff, JUAN CARLOS GIL, respectfully requests that the Honorable Court issue (i) a Declaratory Judgment determining Defendants, at the commencement of the subject lawsuit, was and is in violation of Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 et seq.; (ii) Injunctive relief against Defendants, including an order to make all readily achievable alterations to the facilities; or to make such facilities readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities to the extent required by the ADA; and to require Defendants to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford all offered goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages or accommodations to individuals with disabilities; and by failing to take such steps that may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services; (iii) An award of attorneys' fees, costs and litigation expenses pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12205; and (iv) such other relief as the Court deems just and proper, and/or is allowable under Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Dated: June 14, 2022

GARCIA-MENOCAL & PEREZ, P.L.

Attorneys for Plaintiff

4937 S.W. 74th Court

Miami, Florida 33155

Telephone: (305) 553-3464

Facsimile: (305) 553-3031

Primary E-Mail: ajperez@lawgmp.com

Secondary E-Mails: bvirues@lawgmp.com
dperaza@lawgmp.com

By: /s/ Anthony J. Perez
ANTHONY J. PEREZ
Florida Bar No.: 535451
BEVERLY VIRUES
Florida Bar No.: 123713